

dietary intake of pregnant and postpartum women, improving their weight gain.

For infants, WIC prenatal benefits reduce low and very low birth weights. WIC lowers infant mortality rate by 25 percent among participating Medicaid beneficiaries.

For children, WIC participation leads to higher rates of immunization against childhood diseases. The immunization rate in Pasco County, FL, is almost 100 percent and this rate is attributed to the WIC Program. WIC also reduces anemia among children.

WIC children are more ready to learn as compared to those children not in WIC. Four- and five-year-olds participating in WIC have better vocabularies and digit memory scores than children not participating in WIC.

Numerous studies have shown that WIC is not only a successful prevention program, it is cost effective. WIC is a Government program that actually saves money.

Every dollar spent on pregnant women in WIC produces between \$2 to \$4 in Medicaid savings for newborns and their mothers. In 1992, WIC benefits averted \$853 million in health expenditures during the first year of life of infants.

WIC should be a model for entrepreneurial government. In 1994, \$1.1 billion in rebate revenue was generated from the manufacturers of infant formula, allowing 1.5 million more participants to be served. Local WIC agencies coordinate their services with other health and social service programs as needed. By coordinating these services, the WIC Program is able to reduce the number of bureaucracies a family must deal with. H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, currently includes the WIC Program in a nutrition block grant. I am concerned that if WIC is included in this block grant, the program will lose critical components that make it a success today.

In closing, I would like to include as a part of this statement a letter I received from one of my constituents, Clara Lawhead, who is the director of the Pasco County, FL, WIC Program.

A partial quote from that letter says:

WIC is helping us to shape our future by helping to produce healthier children. WIC is not only vital to maintaining and improving our current health as a nation, but will be absolutely instrumental in creating a healthy population for the next century.

I have seen what the WIC Program can do for children and their mothers. We must make sure our reform efforts do not erode the ability of a proven program like WIC to provide essential services to women and children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to very carefully review proposals that reform our Nation's nutrition programs as we craft final welfare reform legislation.

The letter referred to follows:

ODESSA, FL, January 31, 1995.

Congressman MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BILIRAKIS: Recent legislative proposals threaten the survival of the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, known as WIC. WIC provides access to maternal, prenatal and pediatric health care services for a targeted high risk population. It is a prevention program designed to influence a lifetime of good nutrition and health behaviors. WIC provides quality nutrition education and services, breastfeeding promotion and education and food prescriptions to qualified participants. WIC is administered through area health agencies and coordinates services with other maternal and child health care. More than 70 evaluation studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of WIC and proven medical, health and nutrition successes for women, infants and children.

WIC has proven its cost effectiveness in the past and will continue to present the public with cost savings in the future, unless this legislation, which would severely limit the WIC Program, is passed. Because of the WIC Program, for example, Medicaid costs were reduced on average from \$12,000 to \$15,000 per infant for very low birthweight prevented. In 1990, the federal government spent \$296 million on prenatal WIC benefits, averting \$853 million in health expenditures during the first year of life. Every dollar spent on pregnant women in WIC produces \$1.92 to \$4.21 in Medicaid savings for new borns and their mother. These are incredible examples of the savings that the WIC Program brings to our country each year.

Even more important to the American public than the cost savings are the incredible improvements to the health of our infants and children. Infant mortality during the first 28 days was reduced with WIC participation in four out of five states. The infant mortality rate has been reduced by 25% to 66% among Medicaid beneficiaries participating in WIC. WIC significantly improves breastfeeding rates, immunization rates of children and children's diets. WIC reduces the rates of anemia among children. Four and five year olds participating in WIC in early childhood have better vocabularies and digit memory scores than children not participating in WIC. WIC is helping us to shape our future, by helping to produce healthier children. WIC is not only vital to maintaining and improving our current health as a nation, but will be absolutely instrumental in creating a healthy population for the next century, unless this legislation is allowed to pass with WIC included.

Congressman Bilirakis, it would be in the best interest of all Americans, both young and old, if the proposed legislation, called the "Personal Responsibility Act" and a "Medicaid Swap" were not allowed to be approved, with WIC included, by the United States Congress. Unlike most of the institutions mentioned in these pieces of legislation, the WIC program is not a welfare program, rather a supplemental nutrition program. The participants of WIC include middle class Americans, a part of society which can ill afford more benefits removed from their grasp. Americans across our great country hope that you and the other members of Congress will have the insight and knowledge to defeat the inclusion of WIC in the proposed legislation.

Sincerely, your friend and ally,

CLARA H. LAWHEAD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

UNITED STATES-CHINA SATELLITE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise questions about the Clinton administration's recent initialing of a trade agreement with the Government of China regarding commercial space launch services.

Commercial space is a growing industry right here in the United States of America. It is an industry with tremendous potential for creating jobs and stimulating local economies. It is also an industry where America is in danger of falling further behind our international competitors.

The original 5-year agreement between the United States and China expired on December 31, 1994. The new agreement expands the number of Chinese launches for international customers to geosynchronous Earth orbit [GEO] through 2001 and requires that Chinese launch prices be on a par with Western launch providers. According to an official with the U.S. Trade Representatives's Office, on a par essentially means that the Chinese can offer a price up to 15 percent lower than the going international rate.

In the initialed agreement, the administration has also established disciplines for satellite launches into low Earth orbit and detailed conditions under which increases in quantitative limit may occur to address shortages in the supply of launch services for U.S. satellite services and users.

The agreement was also initialed 1 week after the explosion of a Chinese March 2E rocket that destroyed a \$160 million Apstar-2 satellite.

What does all this mean? As I'm sure the administration knows, the United States has a burgeoning commercial space market that holds tremendous potential for the U.S. economy. As I indicated on the floor February 3, the French already control roughly 60 percent of the commercial space market. Others, most notably the Chinese and the Russians are closing in fast.

Where the United States has its best opportunity to take the lead in commercial space is in the newly emerging low Earth orbit satellite market. I am concerned by the administration's seeming desire to turn this market over to the Chinese. Ambassador Kantor believes that this agreement carefully balances the interests of the U.S. space launch, satellite, and telecommunications industries.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Mr. Kantor's assessment.

Nobody can blame U.S. companies for wanting to launch satellites at reasonable prices. On the other hand, I'm sure United States companies have some degree of concern about the explosions which have hampered the Chinese Long March program. Aside from these factors, the Clinton administration seems to discount the fact that the United States is uniquely positioned to be a leader in the low Earth orbit market.

On the central coast of California we are building the first polar orbit commercial spaceport in America. The spaceport expects to open its doors in 1996 and will provide a unique service—the ability to launch in polar orbit and launch for less money. It is the goal of the California spaceport to the one of the world's primary facilities for moving surface infrastructure into space. In addition, the California spaceport intends to do it safely, efficiently, and for less money—roughly \$5,000 per pound as opposed to the current scale of \$10,000 per pound.

As I mentioned a few weeks ago, I will soon be introducing national spaceport legislation. My intent is to create an environment that allows the U.S. commercial space industry to evolve, mature, and flourish.

□ 1500

This is an industry that is already on the move in California, but it is much more than just California. The United States has many potential launch bases—including Alaska and Hawaii—plus the two existing ones in California and Florida. The question we must ask is, with existing spaceport facilities—plus all of the potential launch bases—and a healthy market for boosters and satellites, why isn't the United States in a better position to compete with our international competitors for a bigger share of the commercial launch market?

The administration, by continuing to parcel out this market, is not only putting the United States at a competitive disadvantage, it is taking jobs away from Americans and it is discouraging what could be a hugely successful market for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I'm frankly a little puzzled by the administration's entire approach to the trade with the Chinese. As a Presidential candidate, Bill Clinton stated that as President, he would not renew most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status. Typically, the President changed his mind and opted for a policy of engagement.

A few weeks ago the Clinton administration announced its intention to impose a billion dollars' worth of punitive tariffs on Chinese imports over intellectual property rights. And just yesterday, while the No. 2 official from U.S. trade representative's office was in China negotiating copyrights, Energy Secretary O'Leary was there announcing \$6 billion in energy deals.

Hovering over this is the enormous trade deficit with the Chinese. When the figures were announced last week, Ambassador Kantor tried to paint a positive picture of this

deficit—a picture that Democrat Senator DORGAN of North Dakota described as: "the most bizarre interpretation that I have ever heard" of bad economic news.

Our trade policy with the Chinese seems to be going in several different directions. I would respectfully submit that the administration rethink the commercial launch agreement, particularly as it relates to low Earth orbit satellite launches. If the Clinton administration is interested in contributing to the success of a commercial space market, perhaps they would consider doing it in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the Clinton administration to take a look at this and support the American commercial space industry.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE CIVILIZED: THAT IS THE QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATEMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today in support of continued Federal funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Institute for Museum Services and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. To be or not to be civilized; that is the question, Mr. Speaker.

A civilized society must include art and cultural enrichment, and it is one of the responsibilities of government to support that aspect of our civilization. We get what we pay for. We cannot rely solely on the good will of a relatively few private individuals to fund the arts—it is the duty of us all.

This Nation's investment in the arts is one of the best we make. For example, the approximately \$2 million in Federal funding for the NEA, NEH, and IMS that goes to my county in California, San Diego County, is matched by nearly four times that amount in local contributions. This is a perfect example of public-private partnership. The Government's funding stimulates local giving to the arts which in turn stimulates local economies.

According to a recent study commissioned by the California Arts Council, nonprofit art organizations contribute some \$2.1 billion annually to California's economy, generate \$77 million in tax revenue, and create some 100,000 jobs. Yes, the arts are important to the State economy of California, and to other States as well. Business Week says that Americans spent \$340 billion on entertainment in 1993.

Critics tell us that the arts are only for the elite. Nothing could be further from the truth. Audiences and participants alike are people from all walks of life. Nearly 40 million tickets were sold last year to theater, music, and dance performances. Nielsen-rating figures show that 56.5 percent of households watching PBS programs earn less than \$40,000 a year. And a USA Today/CNN/Gallup poll showed that 76 percent of respondents thought the Government

should continue to fund public broadcasting. Exposure to the arts is especially important for our children. If our young people can be motivated, thrilled, enriched, and "turned on" by exciting experiences in theater, painting, pottery, or dance, they will be less likely to "turn on" to drugs or gangs to fill their empty hours and empty souls.

Barbra Streisand, in a speech at Harvard University earlier this month, told how participation in the choral club at her Brooklyn high school was the beginning of her career—and she urges more support for the arts, not less. She asks how we can accept a country which has no orchestras, choruses, libraries, or art classes to nourish our children. How many more talents like Barbra Streisand's are out there, whom we will lose when there are no programs to challenge them?

In San Diego County, the San Diego Opera Company and the San Diego Symphony provide opportunities for kids to attend the opera and symphony concerts. The opera regularly goes out to schools with ensemble performances.

San Diego's recipients of arts funding range from elementary schools and universities to KPBS public radio and TV to the Samahan Philippine Dance Company and the Centro Cultural de la Raza to the Balboa Park Museums and the Old Globe Theater, groups representing the entire population of San Diego County.

TheatreForum, and international theater magazine published at UCSD; the renowned La Jolla Playhouse whose productions go on to thrill audiences on Broadway and in the rest of the country; an international festival at locations on both sides of the border between San Diego and Tijuana, Mexico; graduate internships at the Museum of Photographic Arts; touring exhibitions from the Museum of Contemporary Arts in San Diego. I could go on and on. These and hundreds of other art forms are advanced by arts funding in San Diego County.

Even so, among all First World nations, the United States now spends the least on Federal arts support per citizen—and we are thinking of reneging on that support. If we say no to culture, we will prove, in the words of Los Angeles Philharmonic managing director Ernest Fleishmann, that "we are the dumbest Nation on the planet."

According to the General Accounting Office, the Department of Defense plans to spend \$9 billion over the next 7 years building nuclear attack submarines that the Pentagon admits it does not need. That \$9 billion could sustain the Arts and Humanities endowments at current levels for 26 years. 26 years of National Public Radio, Big Bird, music and art for kids—or superfluous subs for the Pentagon. Is this a difficult choice?

If we defund the NEA, the NEH, the IMS and PBS, we will be telling the world that we no longer take pride in